arXiv:1403.5416v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 21 Mar 2014

The Cost of Remembering: the Landauer Bound in Associative Memories

M. Cristina Diamantini*
INFN and Dipartimento di Fisica, University of Perugia, via A. Pascoli, I-06100 Perugia, Italy

Carlo A. Trugenberger†
SwissScientific, chemin Diodati 10, CH-1223 Cologny, Switzerland

(Dated: March 24, 2014)

We analyse the Landauer limit in the framework of the Hopfield neural network model of associative memory, where errors due to thermal and disorder fluctuations must be included. In this case, the Landauer limit must be regarded as a lower bound on the work for remembering stored patterns. We derive the correction terms due to thermal and disorder noise and show how the capacity limits of the Hopfield associative memory are just another manifestation of the Landauer limit. Our results suggest a general connection between Landauer's limit and continuous phase transitions in which the entropy at the critical temperature can be used as a measure of the information content of the ordered low-temperature phase.

PACS numbers: 11.10.-z,11.15.Wx,73.43.Nq,74.20.Mn

Forgetting is costly: this is the statement of the celebrated Landauer limit [1] that sets the lower bound $k\ln(2)$ on the entropy loss when erasing one bit of information. Correspondingly, this erasure costs a minimum work of $kT\ln(2)$, which reconciles Maxwell's demon with the second law of thermodynamics [2].

One can, however obtain a bargain by being sloppy. Indeed, if one relaxes the requirement of perfect erasure and admits errors, the original Landauer limit and the associated minimum cost of erasure can be lowered [3], although there is still an absolute minimum of work necessary to erase stochastically one bit. This has been shown explicitly both for measurement errors in a Szilard engine [4] and for erasure errors in a double well realisation of a single bit [5].

The Landauer theorem is usually discussed in the framework of traditional sequential digital computers where it is derived as the energy cost needed for resetting all N bits of a register to their standard value $+1$ starting from a completely unknown configuration in which each possible state of the register has the same probability $1/2^N$. This resetting procedure is considered as an erasure of the original information in the register and thus the Landauer theorem is considered as setting a lower limit on the work needed to forget. In this setting, although the computer is considered as in contact with a thermal bath, the switches are fully deterministic and temperature is thus essentially irrelevant. Errors are thus unnatural in this framework, although, as pointed out in [3], future nanoscale implementations must necessarily take into account also thermal fluctuations of the switches.

Sequential computers are not the only existing computer architecture though. Neural networks [6] have been proposed to build machines capable of performing tasks for which the sequential circuit model of Babbage and von Neumann are not well suited, like pattern recognition, categorization and generalization. Since these higher cognitive tasks are typical of biological intelligences, the design of these parallel distributed processing systems has been largely inspired by the physiology of the human brain. The Hopfield model [7, 8] is one of the best studied and most successful neural networks. It was designed to model one particular higher cognitive function of the human brain, that of associative pattern retrieval or associative memory.

In traditional computers, the storage of information requires setting up a lookup table (RAM). The main disadvantage of this address-oriented memory system lies in its rigidity. Retrieval of information requires a precise knowledge of the memory address and, therefore, incomplete or noisy inputs are not permitted. Biological information retrieval, on the contrary is possible on the basis of partial knowledge of the memory content, without knowing an exact storage location. Such an associative pattern recall is one of the main characteristics of the human brain.

It is the purpose of the present paper to investigate the Landauer limit in the framework of associative memories like the Hopfield neural network. Contrary to the usual discussions, in this case errors due to both thermal and disorder fluctuations are not only natural but actually unavoidable. We shall prove that the "noisy version" [3] of the Landauer limit holds also in this framework and we will derive the appropriate modifications to include thermal and disorder noise. Interestingly, however, for associative memories, the transition from a totally unknown state of the network to a state of the network corresponding to the stored pattern (which is gauge equivalent to a state with all neurons $+1$ [6]) is, by definition, the process of remembering, rather than forgetting. So, in this

*Electronic address: cristina.diamantini@pg.infn.it
†Electronic address: ca.trugenberger@bluewin.ch

framework, the Landauer limits actually sets the minimum energy cost necessary for remembering. If the noise is not too large this energy is exactly provided by the network, which is thus maximally efficient. Otherwise there is a phase transition to a state in which remembering is not anymore possible: errors become so important that they prevent the formal reset operation, since the minimum energy gap vanishes. In particular, it is well known that the capacity to store patterns of associative memories like the Hopfield model is limited by a spin-glass [8] transition when the number of patterns exceeds a critical value: there is a limit on the number of things that can be remembered. We show how these capacity limits of the Hopfield model are intimately connected with the Landauer limit.

Our results are suggestive of a deep connection of the Landauer bound with (continuous) phase transitions characterised by an order parameter m, those typically associated with spontaneous symmetry breaking. The order parameter vanishes in the high-temperature symmetric phase but becomes finite in the low-temperature ordered phase. We propose to view this ordering transition exactly as a resetting operation of a computer register of $N_{\rm ord}$ of information bits to their standard value. When viewed from this angle, the entropy $S(T_c)$ at the transition must be $kN_{\rm ord}\ln(2)$, otherwise the Landauer bound would be violated in the ordering transition. Conversely one can compute the minimum number $N_{\rm ord}$ of information bits in a completely ordered phase of matter as $S(T_c)/k\ln(2)$.

The Hopfield model [7] consists in an assembly of N binary neurons s_i, $i = 1 \dots N$, which can take the values ± 1 representing their firing (+1) and resting (-1) states. The neurons are fully connected by symmetric synapses with coupling strengths $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$ ($w_{ii} = 0$). Depending on the signs of these synaptic strengths, the couplings will be excitatory (> 0) or inhibitory (< 0). The network is characterised by an energy function

$$E = -\frac{J}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} w_{ij}\ s_i s_j\ , \quad s_i = \pm 1\ , \quad i,j = 1 \dots N\ , \quad (1)$$

where J represents the (positive) coupling constant. The dynamical evolution of the network state is defined by the random sequential updating (in time t) of the neurons according to the rule

$$s_i(t+1) = \mathrm{sign}\left(h_i(t)\right)\ , \quad (2)$$

$$h_i(t) = J \sum_{i \neq j} w_{ij} s_j(t)\ , \quad (3)$$

where h_i is the local magnetization. The synaptic coupling strengths are chosen according to the Hebb rule [6]

$$w_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1\dots p} \sigma_i^\mu \sigma_j^\mu\ , \quad (4)$$

where σ_i^μ, $\mu = 1 \dots p$ are p binary patterns to be memorized.

An associative memory is now defined as a dynamical mechanism that, upon preparing the network in an initial state s_i^0 retrieves the stored pattern σ_i^λ that most closely resembles the presented pattern s_i^0, where resemblance is determined by minimizing the Hamming distance, i.e. the total number of different bits in the two patterns. As emerges clearly from this definition, all the memory information in a Hopfield neural network is encoded in the synaptic strengths, which correspond to the spin interactions in (4).

The dynamical evolution (2) of the Hopfield model satisfies exactly this requirement for an associative memory. This is because:

- The dynamical evolution (2) minimizes the energy functional (1), i.e. this energy functional never increases when the network state is updated according to the evolution rule (2). Since the energy functional is bounded by below, this implies that the network dynamics must eventually reach a stationary point corresponding to a, possibly local, minimum of the energy functional.

- The stored patterns σ_i^μ correspond to, possibly local, minima of the energy functional. This implies that the stored patterns are attractors for the network dynamics (2). An initial pattern will evolve till it overlaps with the closest (in Hamming distance) stored pattern, after which it will not change anymore.

Actually the second of these statements must be qualified. Indeed, the detailed behavior of the Hopfield model depends crucially upon the loading factor $\alpha = p/N$, the ratio between the number of stored memories and the number of available bits [6]. For low loading factors all patterns can be efficiently retrieved, whereas for high loading factors the network turns into a spin glass [8] and all retrieval capabilities are lost. Here we shall be first interested in the case of a single stored memory σ_i : in this case the Hopfield model reduces to the long-range ("finite-dimensional") Ising model. Indeed, by a gauge transformation $s_i \to \sigma_i s_i$ the energy functional reduces to

$$E = -\frac{J}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j}\ s_i s_j\ , \quad (5)$$

and the stored memory reduces to $\sigma_i = +1$ for all i. The associative retrieval of this pattern can of course be equivalently seen as resetting an N-bit register to its initial value starting from a given configuration. Contrary to the usual interpretation of this resetting as "erasure", in the present framework it constitutes, by definition, the process of "remembering". This is the point of view we shall adopt here.

An important point is that the neurons of the Hopfield model are usually made stochastic by introducing a fictitious temperature $T = 1/k\beta$ and modifying the

deterministic update law (2) to a probabilistic one by introducing thermal noise:

$$\text{Prob}\left[s_i(t+1) = +1\right] = f\left[h_i(t)\right] \ , \tag{6}$$

where the activation function f is the Fermi function

$$f(h) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-2\beta h)} \ . \tag{7}$$

In the limit of zero temperature, $\beta \to \infty$, the Fermi function approaches the unit step function and the stochastic neural network goes over into the original deterministic one. In a deterministic network, neurons are either permanently active or permanently dormant, depending on the sign of the local magnetization field h. In a stochastic network, the neuron activities fluctuate due to thermal noise.

The mean activity of a single neuron is given by

$$< s_i >= (+1) < f(h_i) > +(-1) < f(-h_i) > \ , \tag{8}$$

where $< \cdots >$ denotes the thermal average. In the mean field approximation $< f(h_i) > \to f(< h_i >)$: this approximation is known to become exact for the long-range Ising model [9]. We can thus use it to obtain a deterministic equation for the thermal averages

$$< s_i >= \tanh\left(\frac{\beta J}{N}\sum_{j\neq i} < s_j >\right) \ , \tag{9}$$

which can be rewritten as the following equation for the mean magnetisation $m \equiv (1/N)\sum_i < s_i >$ in the thermodynamical limit $N \to \infty$:

$$m = \tanh\left(\beta J m\right) \ , \tag{10}$$

For $\beta J < 1$ the hyperbolic tangent is always smaller than the linear curve $x = m$ and thus the only solution is $m = 0$. For $\beta J > 1$, instead, there are three solutions, $m = 0$ and $m = \pm m_0(\beta)$. It is easy to show, however, that only the solutions $m = \pm m_0(\beta)$ are stable against small fluctuations. There is thus a critical temperature $T_c = J/k$ above which the model is disordered and remembering is not possible anymore. Below this critical temperature, instead, partial erasure is possible since $m \neq 0$: the quality of erasure increases as the temperature is lowered since $m \to 1$ for $T \to 0$. As expected, the number of errors due to to thermal fluctuations diminishes when the temperature is lowered.

In order to establish a connection with the Landauer bound we have now to define what we mean by remembering (or erasing in the setting of standard digital computers) in presence of thermal noise. To illustrate this we shall consider the process of simulated annealing [8]. Simulated annealing is an optimisation heuristics developed to find approximate solutions for the global minimum of complex energy landscapes like the Hopfield model (1) with many stored patterns, when spin glass behaviour sets in. The idea is to thermalise the stochastic neurons at a given fictitious temperature T by, e.g. the Metropolis algorithm [10], then lower the temperature, thermalise the network again and so on, until $T = 0$ is reached. Thermalizing the network first at high temperatures serves the purpose to avoid getting stuck in local minima, lowering the temperature with an appropriate slow schedule, as in physical annealing, the network will eventually settle in its global minimum. In our setting, simulated annealing can be used as a general paradigm to model remembering in the presence of thermal noise: one starts with the critical temperature $T_0 = T_c$ and one lowers the fictitious temperature to a desired final value T. The corresponding value $m(T)$ will tell us what is the average rate of errors in the erasure process at this temperature. The important point here is that, in this framework admitting thermal noise is the natural procedure to avoid getting stuck in wrong memories when the network encodes many patterns. Note also that this procedure is efficient in the sense that all work done by lowering the temperature goes into lowering the entropy of the system, without any dispersion into a physical thermal bath.

This model can be solved exactly by the mean field approximation. Let us compute the partition function at temperature T. To this end we expand the spin variables s_i around their mean value m as $s_i = m + \delta s_i$, with $\delta s_i \equiv (s_i - m)$ and keep only the lowest order terms in δs_i in the mean field Hamiltonian. This becomes (up to an irrelevant constant $J/2$)

$$E = \frac{JNm^2}{2} - Jm\sum_i s_i \ . \tag{11}$$

At this point computing the partition function becomes effectively a one-dimensional problem,

$$Z = \sum_{\text{conf.}} e^{-\beta E} = e^{-\beta JNm^2/2}\left[2\cosh(\beta Jm)\right]^N \ . \tag{12}$$

Once the partition function is known, the entropy S can be computed

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\partial}{\partial T}(kT\ln Z) \\ &= kN\left[\ln(2\,\cosh(\beta mJ)) - \beta mJ\,\tanh(\beta mJ)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

When $T = T_c$ the erasure rate $m = 0$ and the entropy takes the value $S = kN\ln 2$. When $T = 0$, remembering is perfect, $m = 1$ and $S = 0$. As a consequence, the entropy loss per bit in our simulated annealing erasure procedure at temperature T is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\Delta S}{kN} &= \frac{1}{kN}\left(S_{T_c} - S_T\right) \\ &= \ln 2 - \ln(2\,\cosh(\frac{mT_c}{T})) + \frac{mT_c}{T}\,\tanh(\frac{mT_c}{T}) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Since the ordering procedure by lowering the fictitious temperature is efficient, this expression represents the

Landauer bound for stochastic Hopfield networks at temperature T. When $T = 0$ and, correspondingly remembering is perfect, $m = 1$, one recovers the original bound ln (2). For higher temperatures, when errors are permitted due to thermal fluctuations, the bound is correspondingly lower until it reaches 0 when $T \to T_c$ and thermal fluctuations become so strong that no remembering is possible anymore.

This noisy Landauer bound can also be rewritten in terms of the error probability. Due to the stochastic update rule (6), the probability that a neuron flips due to thermal noise is given by

$$\text{Prob}\left[s_i(t+1) = -s_i(t)\right] = \frac{\exp\left[-\beta h_i(t) s_i(t)\right]}{2\,\cosh[\beta h_i(t) s_i(t)]} \ . \quad (15)$$

Since we have considered here resetting to a memory register in which all bits are +1, let us define as error probability p the probability that a neuron flips from +1 (the desired value) to -1 (the wrong value):

$$p = \text{Prob}\left[+1 \to -1\right] \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1-m) = \frac{\exp\left(-\beta J m\right)}{2\,\cosh(\beta J m))} \ . \quad (16)$$

In terms of this error probability, the noisy Landauer bound can be rewritten as

$$\frac{-\Delta S}{kN} = \ln 2 + p\,\ln(p) + (1-p)\,\ln(1-p) \ , \quad (17)$$

which corresponds exactly with the previously derived [3] expressions in terms of error rates. Combined with eq. (10), however, the probability (16) gives the explicit expression of the Landauer bound for this model when errors are due to thermal fluctuations. Eq. (17) establishes explicitly the connection between the thermodynamic entropy as a function of temperature in the ordered phase and the information-theoretic mutual information of measurement [4], a new and important result.

It is important to stress the deep connection between Landauer 's limit and the phase transition in this model. At $T = T_c$ the entropy difference between the increasingly disordered state of the model and its perfectly ordered $T = 0$ state reaches the exact level $\Delta S = kN\ln(2)$ permitted by the Landauer bound. Since the disordering procedure by slowly raising the fictitious temperature is efficient, it is impossible to keep disordering continuously the system without violating Landauer's bound and, thus, the second law of thermodynamics. The only way out is that a phase transition to an entirely new state of matter takes place at $T = T_c$. The generalised Landauer theorem states that the sum of the entropy loss per bit and the one-bit error entropy cannot be lower than the bound $k\ln(2)$ and is exactly equal to this bound when the procedure is efficient. When this bound is saturated by the error entropy no resetting (remembering here) is anymore possible and a phase transition occurs.

Let us apply this principle to another type of noise typical of associative memories: disorder noise due to many stored patterns. To this end let us consider deterministic neurons by setting the temperature $T = 0$. However, we shall return to the generic case in which p patterns are stored in the network, one of which can always be chosen as the state with all N neurons in the state +1 by the a gauge transformation [6]. In this case, all other $(p-1)$ patterns act as disorder noise by the phenomena of cross-talk, essentially linear combination patterns arising as mixtures of stored patterns. In this case the loading factor $\alpha = p/N$ plays a role analogous to the temperature by determining the error rate due to cross-talk. One can show [6] using the replica trick [8] that, in this case, the order parameter is determined by the transcendental equations:

$$m = \text{erf}\left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{2r\alpha}}\right) \ , \qquad r = \frac{1}{\left(1 - \sqrt{2/\pi r\alpha}\right)^2} \ , \quad (18)$$

where r is a second order parameter characterising the disorder. In this case the phase transition is discontinuous, the order parameter jumps from 0.967 to 0 at a loading $\alpha = 0.138$. Unfortunately, as in the case of generic spin glass models [11], the assumption of complete replica symmetry leads to an unphysical negative entropy at zero temperature. This prevents an explicit derivation of the Landauer bound connection in this more complicated case of disorder errors. Conversely, however, the general result of Landauer must apply also in this case and thus the exact entropy difference $-\Delta S(\alpha)$ between the spin-glass phase and the recall phase of the Hopfield model is given again by eq. (17) with $p = (1-m)/2$ and m the order parameter as a function of the loading α. In the case of the Hopfield model, the order parameter jumps discontinuously to zero from a finite value, in the general case, however, eq. (17) sets a generic thermodynamic limit on remembering for any memory model: when errors due to the interaction between stored patterns saturate the generalised Landauer bound there is no "room" for genuine remembering anymore.

This is also suggestive of a general relation of this type for all systems undergoing a continuous phase transition from a symmetric high-temperature phase to an ordered low-temperature one. The transition of the order parameter from 0 in the symmetric phase to 1 in the completely ordered state can always be interpreted as the resetting of a memory register to its standard value. In this sense one can interpret the quantity $S(T_c)/k\ln(2)$ as the number of information bits encoded in the low-temperature ordered state of matter.

[1] R. Landauer, *IBM J. Res. Develop.* **5** (1961) 183.

[2] C. H. Bennet, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21** (1982) 905.

[3] L. Gammaitoni, arXiv :1111.2937v1 (2011).
[4] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev.* **E85** (2012) 021104.
[5] A. Berut, A. Arakelyan, A. Petrosyan, S. Cilberto, R. Dillenschneider and E. Lutz, *Nature* **483** (2012) 187.
[6] B. Müller and J. Reinhardt, "Neural Networks", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
[7] J. J. Hopfield, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **79** (1982) 2554.
[8] For a review see: M. Mezard, G. Parisi and M. A. Virasoro, Spin Glass Theory and Beyond", World Scientific, Singapore, 1987.
[9] See e.g.: J. Zinn-Justin, "Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena", Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989.
[10] N. Metropolis, A. Rosenbluth, M. Rosenbluth, A.Teller and E. Teller, *J. Chem. Phys.* **21** (1953) 1087.
[11] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, *Phys. Rev. Lett,* **35** (1975) 1792; *Phys. Rev. B17* (1978)4384.